In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1965

No. 1247

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, PETITIONER

v.

NATIONAL WOODWORK MANUFACTURERS' ASSN., ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM FOR PETITIONER

In footnote 16 of the Board's petition, after quoting from the construction-industry proviso to Section 8(e) of the National Labor Relations Act, we stated: "This proviso was not satisfied here, since the doors were not manufactured on the job site."

This statement is too broad, and should be amended to read as follows:

> Since the Board found that the contract provision here was not within Section 8(e), it had no occasion to determine whether, if it had been, it would have satisfied the proviso. Compare *United Association Pipefitters (American Boiler Manufacturers Association)*, 154 NLRB No. 12, August 5, 1965, with *Na-*

216-495—66

tional Labor Relations Board v. *Local 294, Teamsters*, 342 F. 2d 18, 21–22 (C.A. 2).

Respectfully submitted.

THURGOOD MARSHALL,
Solicitor General.

ARNOLD ORDMAN,
General Counsel,
National Labor Relations Board.

MAY 1966.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1966